

~~Comstock Club~~  
~~Speech by~~  
Amb. Carlucci

11 Aug 1978  
Sacramento, Cal.

I am very pleased to be able to substitute for Admiral Turner today much as I know he wanted to be with you because I think it is terribly important that Stan and I get out and talk to the people of our country about the very fundamental debate that we are in in the U.S. today concerning our intelligence agencies. We are the only country that I can think of in the history of the world that has ever tried to define the role of the secret agency in a free society and that is a very hard task and it is doubly hard because you can hear about our failures but you very seldom hear about our successes indeed almost by definition if an intelligence success becomes public it is then a failure so the problem is a difficult one but I think it can be done and I think we are making some progress. I think we are also making progress by making public some of our product in helping the American public to understand just what we do, just what you are getting for you tax dollar. I would like to review just briefly with you today some of the progress and some of the problems as I see them. First of all the intelligence business is very little 007 tupe stuff if any at all, it is very painstaking business. It really is quite simple , its simply a matter of putting together the best available information so that the policymakers can make the best possible decisions. We in the intelligence business are not policymakers. We assemble the facts which come from public sources, analyze it and present their conclusions to the policymakers and to give you a dramatic example of the importance of this \_\_\_\_\_ function I think most historians are now inclined to agree. But had the available information been pulled together, in NOvember and December of 1941, Pearl Harbor would not of happened the information was there but there was no organization

to put it all together and to present it to the President and say look out. And indeed the Japanese carrier task force had orders to turn back if they were spotted. And looking at the available information it would have been easy to spot them. As a result of this experience the OSS and its successor organization, the CIA were founded. And it is not unnatural that throughout that period and throughout the period of the so called cold war, the emphasis of the intelligence agencies was on the military capacity of the potential adversary, then in the 1960s as for the CIA and some of the other agencies were beginning to grow like \_\_\_\_\_ the Agency became involved in operational activities some of which frankly in my judgment it was illequest to handle and the results of that are often familiar to all of you, the abuses that were committed although a few traces them back a large part of the abuses originated at the political level and the CIA was being responsive to the political but be that as it may, the abuses were clearly real. I think we have now entered into an entirely new era not just from a stand point of checks and balances, but from a stand point of the nature and the mission of the intelligence function. Sure we are still interested in the strategic capabilities of the Soviet Union we have to be for our own survival. But there are a number of other things that we have to be interested in as well in this day and age we have to be interested in Africa for example, but you can't like we use to in the old days look at one country in isolation you can't say what is the situation in Ethiopia because you got to think of Somilia, you got to think of Kenya reaction or about the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen right across the water, how the Saudis are acting and you move on down to the Sudan which touches on the Zaire which gets you into the Angolan situation and you can turn over to \_\_\_\_\_ and on up

you go all the way to Afghanistan, I'm not saying \_\_\_\_\_  
in what's going on in these areas but I am saying that what happens  
in one country very clearly impacts very quickly on another country.  
So its no longer enough just to have an analyst who can deal with country X  
you have to look at problems on a reasonable basis, also we have to look  
in our analysis many more issue oriented types of questions one of the  
things that we are all interested in today is the question of nuclear  
proliferation, how do we keep track of what other countries are doing  
some of them clandestantly in this field. For SALT you respective of  
what you view might be on the current negotiations, I think we all hope  
that sooner or later we can have a SALT treaty but a SALT is only as  
good as our capacity to monitor and that gets back to the intelligence  
function. Or take two other areas which unfortunately in the world today  
seem to be growth areas, terrorism and narcotics. If you are going to  
deal with the terrorists you have to have the intelligence on what they  
are up to or intelligence information can help our Drug Enforcement  
Administration deal with the narcotics problems around the world.

\_\_\_\_\_ is not an isolated phenomenon. But finally you  
can't look at the security of the United States today without looking  
at our dependence on other areas of the world examining such questions  
as the growth rate in the Federal Republic of Germany or looking at  
the question of oil reserves and as most of you may be aware of we put  
out a highly controversial study on this, whether you agree with this or  
not, you have to agree that a study of these matters is fundamental to  
our long range interests. So intelligence wise, these are different  
times, they are exciting times, never in my judgment has there been so  
much interest , part of the Executive Branch, part of the Congress in  
our intelligence problems and that offers an opportunity. But yes we are

still living in the crisis of confidence and that crisis of confidence makes its very difficult for us to take full advantage of those opportunities. Certainly government needs to be accountable and certainly people like Woodward and Bernstein rendered an outstanding service in what they did. And certainly we want to encourage journalists to be investigative journalists but I don't think we should become carried away with an obsession about uncovering one thing after another, sure it is important to set up systems of accountability, don't misunderstand me, but it is equally important in a certain period of time to build and to build requires that we restore confidence in our governments institutions and I speak to you as a career servant of some 25 years standing who is proud to be a government servant but who is quite frankly distressed at this lack of confidence and is looking for ways to rebuild it. As far as this Administration is concerned in the intelligence community, I think a very good start has been made along those lines. An extremely tight system of checks and balances have been building and I think it would be virtually impossible of the kinds of abuses that occurred in the past to repeat themselves. The President has reorganized the Intelligence Community under Executive Order pointing the Community at large, the general community under the directorship of Admiral Turner and myself as his immediate subordinate which means a better allocation of resources. We have authority over budgets of the other intelligence agencies including the intelligence portions of the Defense Department and the State Department, trying to get duplication down to a minimum. But more importantly, to try and get a common sense of priorities. This same Executive Order sets up a system of checks and balances to make certain that there are full range of guarantees for the civil liberties of all

Americans. But as of that, a check the President has created the Intelligence Oversight Board consisting of three distinguished Americans Tom Farmer, former Governor, Ambassador Bill Scranton and former Senator Gore, which reports only to the President is independent of the intelligence agencies and which can receive and has power to receive any complaints of wrong doing anywhere in the Intelligence Community. This means that anyone of our employees can go directly to the IOB without consulting us and saying I think there is something wrong going on here and the IOB has full authority to investigate it and to make its report to the President. There is also the confirmation process and we seemed to have forgotten that in this day and age, I myself went through some 30 days of investigation by seven Senate staffers full time, 10 hours of hearings at an unanimous vote. I frankly think that entitles me to a measure of confidence, but I don't always find that that is the case. I find that people say oh, well that is meaningless because it was meaningless in the past but I can assure you that the confirmation process as least as it concerns the intelligence agencies is not meaningless. And finally there is a question of congressional oversight, as you may be aware, the Congress has organized itself into intelligence committees, they are select committees, handpicked committees withoutstanding Senators and Congressmen on them. They have set up the necessary security safeguards and they are exercising very close oversight over us. They have access to all the information they need to exercise this oversight and we welcome this we think it is helpful, we think it is the best way to restore public confidence in our intelligence agencies and finally there is a question of charter legislation that the Congress is considering. ONce again many of colleagues in other countries think the charter legislation for an intelligence agency is just an impossible task. Hereto we don't agree. We

think the charter legislation would be helpful , it would be helpful in restoring confidence and would be helpful in setting guidelines for our employers and their leaders. So by in large I think things are moving in the right direction but there are some problems that I would like to mention to you. I think we have to have clearly a greater appreciation in the part of the American people that secrecy is the heart of an intelligence operation. No man is going to put his life in your hands by giving you information if he thinks he is going to read that information in the press or if he thinks his name is going to be compromised, it is simply axiomatic. It is also axiomatic that the more people who have access to the information the greater is the likelihood of compromise. And we are frequently critized by the press for excess secrecy and I am willing to conced that there may well be considerable amount of over-classification in government and we are making it a determined effort and I indicated earlier to declassify everything that we can. But I would just hope that my journalists friends would argue just as vigorously to the protection of intelligence sources as they argue for the protection of journalists sources to me the principle is the same except in the cases of intelligence sources we are frequently dealing with peoples lives. We are also in the age of glorification of the whistleblower and I think every agency in the federal government ought to have an outlet for grivances, for dissent, for complaints right up to the top but that doesn't mean in government that everybody should do his own thing, I can remember in my OEO days I once had some difficulty with an agency employee, I asked him to do something and he said no and I said well don't you work for me and he said no and I said but you are in OEO you work for me but he said no I don't, I work for the poor not for you but if everybody is to determine in the federal government and in

intelligence agencies what should be secret and what should not be secret that is government by Chaos. WE will not have a single source anywhere in the world, there has to be a process and there is no effort in this process to prevent criticism of the Agency but nobody can simply enter the agency, leave and write a book and make a profit on the secret information that he learned there, we simply have to have some constraints and the issue is not whether Mr. Snepp revealed classified information or not the issue is to who is to make the judgment of whether it is classified should responsible leadership of the agency confirmed by the Senate make the judgment or should each individual employee. There is also the problem of Freedom of Information Act as it implies to our intelligence agencies. Mind you I think the principle of the law is a good principle and I'm not attacking the FOIA and if we said no we don't think we can give you that information we have 20 days to appeal by statute and then they can take us to court and the individual who said no would be libel and it is not as far fetched as it seems we have had requests for information from foreign embassies from East Germany, we spend about \$550 for FOIA requests and we put 109 man years last year into responding to FOIA requests some of them from ,a great number of them in fact, from a man named Mr. Agee who is the CIA turncoat that some of you may have read about in the papers lately down in Havana announced a campaign to expose all CIA personnel and agency inviting people to write in and in fact in this publication in citing them to violence in setting up an organization at Dupont Circle for this purpose and here we have yet another \_\_\_\_\_<sup>if</sup>/Mr. Agee were giving out agriculture information , Commodity Credit Corp, for certain types of information from the Department of Commerce or maybe certain banking information from the US government there would be immediate



criminal sanctions. But in the case of national security information you have to prove your intent to commit espionage. And there is no way when somebody leaks information to the public that you can make a really good espionage case so we are in effect follow the steps and some legislative remedy to deal with this kind of thing. It's this maliciousness that literally puts the lives of our people in danger. That's the down side but I want to go back and end on the upbeat note. Yes, the adversary is strong and he is getting stronger in the military intelligence sense everyday. We need to be alert. Yes, we have had problems in the U.S. intelligence community but my judgment and the judgment of the Director, we still have the finest intelligence organization, Intelligence Community anywhere in the world and with support from the American public, groups such as yourself. I think we can keep the world's number one intelligence organization and do so and still maintain the necessary checks and balances that preserve the civil liberties of all our citizens.

Thank you very much.